



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/782,712	02/18/2004	Clifton Cook	LOWM110	5586
21658	7590	02/24/2009	EXAMINER	
DYKAS, SHAVER & NIPPER, LLP			VANTERPOOL, LESTER L	
P.O. BOX 877				
BOISE, ID 83701-0877			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3782	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/24/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/782,712	COOK, CLIFTON	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	LESTER L. VANTERPOOL	3782	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 October 2007.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-9, 11-16 and 19-23 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-9, 11-16 and 19-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the drawings filed on October 09, 2007, regarding claim 5, which recites: (the frame member (118) having the narrower width over the user's hips and having the wider at the small of the back and waist) must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner,

the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: claim 7, line 3 recites: “said attachment retaining system” however, the structural limitation term should be “said accessory retaining system”.

Appropriate correction is required.

3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: claim 12, lines 2 & 3 recites: “a duty belt” however, the structural limitation term should be “an ergonomic duty belt”.

Appropriate correction is required.

4. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: claim 20, line 3 recites: “an ergonomic belt” however, the structural limitation term should be “an ergonomic duty belt”.

Appropriate correction is required.

5. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: claim 20, line 14 recites: “said attachment retaining device” however, the structural limitation term should be “said accessory retaining device”.

Appropriate correction is required.

6. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: claim 21, line 2 recites: "said attachment device" however, the structural limitation term should be "accessory retaining device".

Appropriate correction is required.

7. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: claim 23, lines 2 & 3 recites: "a duty belt" however, the structural limitation term should be "an ergonomic duty belt".

Appropriate correction is required.

8. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: claim 22, lines 2 & 3 recites: "a duty belt" however, the structural limitation term should be "an ergonomic duty belt".

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 1 – 3, 5 – 9 & 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rogers (U.S. Patent Number 5722576) in view of Yewer Jr., (U.S. Patent Number 5586969).

Rogers teaches the accessory retaining system (13, 16, 17, 19, 20 & 21) (See Figure 1); and the belt (See Figure 1) configured to allow the user to hold the variety of accessories (12, 40 & 41) in the desired position and orientation with increased comfort.

However, Rogers does not disclose the pliable outer covering; the semi-rigid frame member parallel to the longitudinal axis of the duty belt and inside the pliable outer covering; the ergonomic duty belt is capably configured to form the semi-conically shaped section when placed about the waist of the user, and when worn by the user having the top edge and the bottom edge, the semi-conically shaped section top edge having the smaller circumference than the bottom edge.

Yewer, Jr., teaches the pliable outer covering (18); the semi-rigid frame member (14) parallel to the longitudinal axis of the duty belt (12) and inside the pliable outer covering (18) (See Figure 1); the ergonomic duty belt (12) is capably configured to form the semi-conically shaped section when placed about the waist of the user (See Column 1, lines 34 - 38), and when worn by the user having the top edge and the bottom edge (See Figure 1), the semi-conically shaped section top edge having the smaller circumference than the bottom edge (See Column 4, lines 06 – 13) (See Figures 3 – 5).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to make the pliable outer covering; the semi-rigid frame member parallel to the longitudinal axis of the duty belt and inside the pliable outer covering; the ergonomic

duty belt is capably configured to form the semi-conically shaped section when placed about the waist of the user, and when worn by the user having the top edge and the bottom edge, the semi-conically shaped section top edge having the smaller circumference than the bottom edge as taught by Yewers, Jr., with the ergonomic duty belt of Rogers in order to enhance user back support.

Regarding claim 2, Rogers discloses the detachable inner belt (11) is capable to go through belt loops on a user's pants, and attaches to the ergonomic duty belt.

Regarding claim 3, Rogers discloses the outer belt (10) attaching to the ergonomic duty belt (11) (See Figure 2).

Regarding claim 5, Rogers does not disclose the frame member configured to match the contours of the portion of the portion of the user's body which the frame member engages, by having the narrower width over a user's hips and having the wider at the small of the back and waist.

Yewer Jr., discloses the frame member (14) is configured to match the contours of the portion of the user's body which the frame member (14) engages (See Column 4, lines 60 – 61).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the frame member configured to match the contours of the

portion of the user's body which the frame member engages as taught by Yewer Jr., with the ergonomic duty belt of Rogers in order to enhance users comfort level.

Regarding claim 6, Rogers discloses the accessory retaining system (13, 16, 17, 19, 20 & 21) comprises the strip of attachment material (21, 31 & 27) and at least one loop (30), the attachment material (21, 31 & 27) and the loop (30) configured to connect and hold the outer belt (10) against the ergonomic duty belt (11), the outer belt (10) configured to hold the plurality of attachment devices (22) thereupon (See Column 3, lines 46 – 56) (See Figure 1).

Regarding claim 7, Rogers discloses the accessory retaining system (13, 16, 17, 19, 20 & 21) comprises the plurality of vertically oriented plates (32) disposed along the outer surface (15) of the outer belt (10), the accessory retaining system (13, 16, 17, 19, 20 & 21) further comprising compatibly configured attachment devices (22) configured to connect with the vertically oriented plates (32) (See Figures 1 & 4).

Regarding claim 8, Rogers discloses the accessory retaining system (13, 16, 17, 19, 20 & 21) comprises the plurality of vertically oriented plates (32) disposed along the outer surface (15) of the ergonomic duty belt (See Figure 1), the accessory retaining system (13, 16, 17, 19, 20 & 21) further comprising compatibly configured attachment devices (22) configured to connect with the vertically oriented plates (32) (See Figures 1 & 4).

Regarding claim 9, Rogers discloses the accessory retaining system (13, 16, 17, 19, 20 & 21) comprises the track (13) extending in a generally horizontal direction along the portion of the ergonomic duty belt (See Figure 1), the track (13) configured to receive the correspondingly configured tenon (25, 26 & 33) therein, at least one of the tenons (25, 26 & 33) attached to the tool accessory (12) (See Figure 4).

Regarding claim 23, Rogers discloses the plurality of vertically disposed plates (32) connected to the duty belt, the plates (32) defining spaces there between, the plates (32) and the spaces configured to receive and hold the compatibly configured attachment device (22) upon the ergonomic duty belt,

Wherein the vertical plates (32) further comprise sections of the horizontal tracked attachment system (See horizontal track on outer belt in Figure 1) positioned between the section having vertical plates (32) (See Figure 1); the horizontal tracked attachment system (See horizontal track on outer belt in Figure 1) comprising the track (13) extending in the generally horizontal direction along the portion of the ergonomic duty belt, the track configured to receive the correspondingly configured tenon (25, 26 & 33) therein, at least one of the tenons (25, 26 & 33) attached to the tool accessory (22) (See Figure 4), whereby the horizontal tracked attachment system (See horizontal track on outer belt in Figure 1) maintains the tool accessories (22) in the desired position and orientation upon the ergonomic duty belt (See Figures 1 & 4).

Art Unit: 3782

11. Claims 4, 11, 20 & 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rogers (U.S. Patent Number 5722576) and Yewer Jr., (U.S. Patent Number 5586969) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Thompson (U.S. Patent Number 6634533).

Rogers as modified above does not disclose the ergonomic duty belt comprising multiple foam layers with forms of different densities.

Thompson teaches the ergonomic duty belt (100) comprises multiple foam layers (260 & 261) with forms of different densities (See Column 5, lines 28 – 39) (See Figure 4).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the ergonomic duty belt comprising multiple foam layers with forms of different densities as taught by Thompson with the ergonomic duty belt of Rogers in order to enhance additional back support and users comfort level.

Regarding claim 11, Rogers as modified above does not disclose the inner surface configured to allow varied removable attachment of the variety of padded device therefrom.

Thompson discloses the inner surface (122) configured to allow varied removable attachment of the variety of padded devices therefrom (See Figure 2).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the inner surface configured to allow varied removable attachment of the variety of padded device therefrom as taught by Thompson with the

ergonomic duty belt of Rogers in order to enhance additional back support and users comfort level.

Regarding claim 20, Rogers the inner belt (11) is capable to go through belt loops on a user's pants; and

Rogers discloses the accessory retaining system (13, 16, 17, 19, 20 & 21) comprises the plurality of vertically oriented plates (32) disposed along the outer surface (15) of the outer belt (10), the accessory retaining system (13, 16, 17, 19, 20 & 21) further comprising compatibly configured attachment devices (22) configured to connect with the vertically oriented plates (32) (See Figures 1 & 4).

However, Rogers does not disclose the ergonomic belt, further comprised of: the semi-rigid frame member, the semi-frame member configured to match the contours of the portion of the user's body which the frame member engages.

Yewer Jr., discloses the semi-rigid frame member (14), the semi-rigid frame member (14) is configured to match the contours of the portion of the user's body which the frame member (14) engages (See Column 4, lines 60 – 61).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the frame member configured to match the contours of the portion of the user's body which the frame member engages as taught by Yewer Jr., with the ergonomic duty belt of Rogers in order to enhance users comfort level.

However, Rogers does not disclose the ergonomic duty belt comprising multiple foam layers with forms of different densities covering the semi-rigid frame member.

Thompson teaches the ergonomic duty belt (100) comprised of multiple foam layers (260 & 261) with forms of different densities that is capable of covering the semi-rigid member (200) (See Column 5, lines 28 – 39) (See Figure 4).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the ergonomic duty belt comprising multiple foam layers with forms of different densities covering the semi-rigid frame member as taught by Thompson with the ergonomic duty belt of Rogers in order to enhance additional back support and users comfort level.

However, Rogers does not disclose the pliable outer covering covering the semi-rigid frame member and foam; the ergonomic duty belt is capably configured to form the semi-conically shaped section when placed about the waist of the user, the semi-conically shaped section having the broader portion near its base and the narrow portion near its top, the ergonomic duty belt configured to allow the user to hold a variety of accessories in the desired position and orientation with increased comfort.

Yewer, Jr., teaches the pliable outer covering (18) convering; the semi-rigid frame member (14) and foam; the ergonomic duty belt (12) is capably configured to form the semi-conically shaped section when placed about the waist of the user (See Column 1, lines 34 - 38), the semi-conically shaped section having the broader portion near its base and the narrow portion near its top, the ergonomic duty belt configured to allow the user to hold a variety of accessories in the desired position and orientation with increased comfort (See Column 4, lines 06 – 13) (See Figures 3 – 5).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to make the pliable outer covering covering; the semi-rigid frame member and foam; the ergonomic duty belt is capably configured to form the semi-conically shaped section when placed about the waist of the user, the semi-conically shaped section having the broader portion near its base and the narrow portion near its top, the ergonomic duty belt configured to allow the user to hold a variety of accessories in the desired position and orientation with increased comfort as taught by Yewers, Jr., with the ergonomic duty belt of Rogers in order to enhance user back support.

Regarding claim 21, Rogers discloses the accessory attachment device (13, 16, 17, 19, 20 & 21) further comprises at least one connection section the connection section comprised of the track (13) extending in the generally horizontal direction along the portion of the ergonomic duty belt (See Figure 1), the track (13) configured to receive the corresponding configured tenon (25, 26 & 33) therein, at least one of the tenons (25, 26 & 33) attached to the tool accessory (12) (See Figures 1 & 4).

12. Claims 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 19 & 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Guibord (U.S. Patent Number 6701534 B2) in view of Taragos (U.S. Patent Number 5537709).

Guibord discloses the plurality of vertically disposed plates (60 & 66) connected to the duty belt (10, 30 & 50), the plates (60 & 66) defining spaces there between, the plates (60 & 66) and the spaces configured to receive and hold the compatibly

configured attachment device upon the ergonomic duty belt (10, 30 & 50), the plates (60 & 66) having the generally flat top and the beveled side edge, connected to the belt by the rail section with the square cross-section (See Column 3, lines 40 – 46) (See Figures 1, 4, 5 & 6).

However, Guibord does not disclose the beveled side edge.

Taragos teaches the plate (38) having bevel side edges (See Figures 3 & 4).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to make the plate having bevel side edges as taught by Taragos with the ergonomic duty belt of Rogers in order to enhance adequate anchoring and prevent the articles from accidentally being removed.

Regarding claim 13, Guibord discloses the vertically oriented plates (60 & 66) are configured received and hold the tenon (75) within the space defined by the plates (60 & 66), the tenon (75) further comprising the tab configured to interact with the plate (66) so as to allow the accessory device having the tenon (75) to be placed in a desired position and orientation upon the ergonomic duty belt (10, 30 & 50) (See Figure 4).

Regarding claim 14, Guibord discloses the slotted attachment device (70), the slotted attachment device (70) having the body (72), the body defining the slot (See area between (70 & 75) in Figure 4), the slot (See area between (70 & 75) in Figure 4) configured to receive at least the portion of one of the vertically oriented plates (66) therein, whereby the accessory (73) that is connected to the slotted attachment device

(70) can be removably attached and removed from the ergonomic duty belt (10, 30 & 50) (See Figure 4).

Regarding claim 15, Guibord discloses the vertically disposed plates (66) define grooves (69) therein and wherein each slotted attachment devices (70) further comprise the tab (75), the tab (75) configured to be inserted within at least one of the grooves (69) and to hold the slotted attachment device (70) upon the vertically oriented plates (66) (See Figure 4).

Regarding claim 16, Guibord discloses the connection system (See Figure 5) further comprises the screw (See Screws in Figure 5), the screw (See Screws in Figure 5) configured to engage and hold the slotted attachment devices (70) upon the vertically oriented plate (68) (See Figure 5)

Regarding claim 19, Guibord discloses the vertical plates (60 & 66) are connected in sections to the base plate (60 & 66), and the base plate (60 & 66) is connected to the ergonomic duty belt (10, 30 & 50) (See Figures 1 & 2).

Regarding claim 22, claim 22 is a combination of claims 12, 14, 15 and 16. Therefore, See claims 12, 14, 15 and 16 rejection above.

Response to Arguments

13. Applicant's arguments filed October 09, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues, Thompson does not disclose the semi-rigid member that goes through the longitudinal axis of the belt.

Examiner disagrees, Thompson teaches the semi-rigid member (200) that has longitudinal axis. The semi-rigid member (200) of Thompson extends vertical from the top to the bottom of the belt (See Figure 2).

Applicant argues, Guibord does not disclose the belt plates have a generally flat top and a beveled side edge connected to the belt by a pedestal with a square cross-section.

Examiner disagrees, Guibord teaches the belt plates (60A) have a generally flat top and have beveled side edges connected to the belt (81) with a square cross-section (See Figures 3, 4, 5 & 6).

Applicant argues, Roger does not disclose that the inner belt may fit through the belt loops.

Examiner disagrees, Roger teaches an inner belt (11) that is capable of passing through belt loops of a user's pants.

Applicant argues, there is no reason or suggestion to combine the features of Thompson and Eddy.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

Examiner disagrees, Eddy teaches the outer belt (112) that attaches to the ergonomic duty belt (12) (See Figure 2).

In this case, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the outer belt that attaches to the ergonomic duty belt as taught by Eddy with the ergonomic duty belt of Thompson in order to enhance and provide additional back support.

Applicant argues, there is no reason or suggestion to combine the features of Thompson, Eddy and Rogers.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention

where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

Examiner disagrees, in this case, Thompson teaches the ergonomic duty belt comprising:

the semi-rigid frame member (200), the semi-rigid frame member (200) configured to match the contours of the portion of the user's body which the frame member engages (See Figure 3); the plurality of form layers (260 & 261) comprised of foams of different densities covering the semi-rigid frame member (200) (See Column 5, lines 28 – 39) (See Figure 4), and the pliable outer covering (250) covering the semi-rigid frame member (200) and the foam (See Figures 2, 3 & 4); the ergonomic duty belt (100) configured to form the semi-conically shaped section when placed about the waist of the user, the semi-conically shaped section having the broader portion near its base and the narrower portion near its top (See Column 4, lines 25 – 32), the ergonomic duty belt (100) configured to allow the user to hold the variety of accessories in the desired position and orientation with increased comfort.

Roger teaches an inner belt (11) that is capable of passing through belt loops of a user's pants.

Guibord teaches the belt having the attachment retaining system (See Figure 1) comprises the plurality of vertically oriented plates (60 & 66) disposed along the outer surface of the belt, the attachment retaining system (See Figure 1) further comprising

compatibly configured attachment devices configured to connect with the vertically oriented plates (60 & 66) (See Column 3,—lines 40 – 46) (See Figures 1, 4 & 5).

Therefore, all the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

Conclusion

14. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LESTER L. VANTERPOOL whose telephone number is

(571)272-8028. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (8:30 - 5:00) EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan Newhouse can be reached on 571-272-4544. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Lester L. Vanterpool/
Examiner, Art Unit 3782

/Nathan J. Newhouse/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3782